



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,386	07/01/2005	Bernd Muller	5000-0128PUS1	6302
2292	7590	06/25/2007	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1624		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/541,386	MULLER ET AL.
	Examiner /Venkataraman Balasubramanian/	Art Unit 1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/1/2005</u>	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment, which involved amendment to claims 5 and 6, filed on 7/1/2005, is made of record. Claims 1-10 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement, filed on 7/1/2005, are made of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. In the process claim 7, recitation of "pyrimidines" renders this claim indefinite as it is not clear whether the process is for making a mixture of pyrimidines or a compound of formula I. Replacement of "pyrimidines" with "pyrimidine" is suggested.
2. Recitation of "if appropriate" in the last line of claim 7, renders claim 7 indefinite as it is not clear what is appropriate and what is not. Replacement of "if appropriate" with "optionally" is suggested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanimoto et al., US 6,255,483.

Tanimoto et al., teaches several tricyclic compounds for use in organ transplant, which include instant compounds. See column 1, formula I and note the definition of various variable groups A, B C, X-Y V¹ and V². Also see column 13, formula If and column 14 for B ring definition which include pyrimidine. Note with the given definition of various variable groups, the compounds taught by Tanimoto et al. include instant

Art Unit: 1624

compounds. Specifically, in formula I, B ring is pyrimidine, C ring a heterocycle, A ring is phenyl, X –Y is O-alkyl, O-alkenyloxy and others, the compounds taught by Tanimoto et al., include instant compounds. See entire document. Especially see column 109 for various A ring definitions and note X-Y can be allyloxy group. See also column 115 and note B ring choice S_3 is a pyrimidinyl group as required by instant claims. Also note S_1 is pyridinyl group. See column 150-151, Table 86 for pyridine and pyrimidine compounds.

Tanimoto et al. differs from the instant claims in exemplifying pyrimidine compounds having O-benzyl group for X-Y and other groups hydroxy, sulfonyl etc as substituents for in the phenyl ring. However, Tanimoto et al. when B= S_1 , namely pyridine ring, teaches allyloxy group for X-Y.

In addition, Tanimoto teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in Table 86 those generically recited in column 1-14.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compositions using the teachings of Tanimoto et al., including phenyl ring bearing substituents corresponding to instant compounds and expect resulting composition to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heinemann et al., US 5,385, 905.

Heinemann et al., teaches several pyridylpyrimidine compounds for use as fungicides. See column 1, formula I and note the definition of R^1 , R^2 and R^3 . See column 3-14 for various choices of R^1 , R^2 and R^3 groups. See entire document.

Especially see column 19-24 for various pyridylpyrimidine compounds made and tested as fungicides.

While said compounds do not anticipate the scope of instant claims, they are very closely related, being compounds that differ in H in the reference in the 6-position of the pyrimidine ring vs. methyl in the instant on the said position. However, homologs and compounds that differ only by CH₃ Vs H are not deemed patentably distinct absent evidence of superior or unexpected properties. See *In re Wood* 199 USPQ 137; *In re Lohr* 137 USPQ 548.

Thus it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to expect instant compounds to possess the utility taught by the applied art in view of the close structural similarity outlined above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

Art Unit: 1624

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

6/13/2007